

General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
December 17, 2001
Revised January 8, 2002

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Alexandra Elias	American Planning Association
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Gary Piro	Save Our Land Values
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Liz Higgins	San Diego Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Michael C. Johnson	American Institute of Architects
Mike Stepner	San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects

Public at Large:

Bill Panky	Bonsall
Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Charlene Ayers	
David Pallinger	Ramona
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Jack Orr	
Jan Van Dierendonck	Ramona
Jeanne Pagett	Fallbrook
Juliana Bugbee	Lakeside
Kris Preston	
Lael Montgomery	Valley Center
Lynne Baker	EHL
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Michael Thometz	MERIT
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Pat Flanagan	SDNHM
Ruth Potter	

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
Aaron Barling (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)
Jonathan Smulian (WRT)

Agenda Item II: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for December 3, 2001
 - There were no changes made to the minutes. Motion passed unanimously.
- b) 2002 Calendar
 - Meetings will now be scheduled for every other Tuesday, beginning January 8, 2002. Since some representatives may not be able to accommodate their schedules, it was made clear that alternates will need to be kept in touch with the process.

Agenda Item III: Map Review –

- An uncorrected version of the structure map was made available for viewing at the meeting. This map re-plotted public lands in grey and tribal lands in pale yellow.
- As a result of difficulties with the concepts when beginning work on the mapping process, staff was unable to provide a buff overlay of the draft distribution map.
- Holler had requested input from the group via scenarios that were found while going through the mapping process. These scenarios were presented in graphics that were representative of the application of the concepts. Village, west of the CWA, showed holes bounded by core support areas indicating a mapping difficulty that creates a “donut hole”. According to the concepts, the “hole” cannot be picked up in the mapping process, creating patterns of gaps and irregular boundaries. Another graphic showed how these areas would be picked up. Pryde did not see any reason that the group should not like an irregular pattern and stated that he could accept the second map if the area was designated as a receiving area, otherwise there is no reason to not go with the first map.
- Bowlby thinks that we need to look at opportunities for denser areas and the communities’ needs for open space and agriculture. The first map shows areas that have several larger lots that are connected and he hopes that we would look for those patterns of one acre parcels or larger as rural instead of semi-rural because it can provide wildlife corridors.
 - ❖ **Correction made at the January 8, 2002 Interest Group Committee meeting:** Bowlby stated that the “opportunities for denser areas” were areas within Country Town boundaries. He also “hopes that we look for those patterns of 20 and 40 acre parcels”, which not only provide wildlife corridors, but also other open space uses.
- Tabb feels the group should stick with the concepts learned, particularly, the concentric circle design and so, he does not feel that the first map, with the green open space next to the village core, does not adhere to good planning principles.
- Coombs mentioned that the green area could be a mountain or sensitive habitat. Scarborough added that there are several things missing from the concepts, like environmental constraints. Pryor stated that this particular example was one that is relatively flat, which made it a good example for many reasons. The second map is more efficient because it cuts the costs of infrastructure. There will be areas where the environment will dictate the pattern, but the approach on the second map makes better use of our utilities. Coombs replied that from a design standpoint, the second map is the better map, however, if filling in the green is not needed for accommodating the population, then we should not turn it red.
- Silver stated that infill makes sense near the village core but the periphery was not given. He feels that the group can unite on an infill strategy but believes there are areas that according to the concepts are green, whereas, some might agree should be yellow. He stated that he can support this as long as there is a counter to it that keeps rural greenbelts.
- Chase stated that design standards have to be the key issue and that, although infill is great, it is going to overload the circulation. She asked if there was going to be a transit overlay. Pryor responded that staff will be looking into it.
- **Motion:** Whalen moved to direct County staff to employ their professional judgment and good planning principles, to develop a revised structure map, using the 2020 concepts criteria that we have been working with for the past few years. Staff will use the field check ground-truthing data to assist in determining adequate road capacity. Scarborough added good planning principles, flexibility, environmental constraints/topography, judgment and fine tuning, transit/transit overlay, and design standards, which were all based off other members’ criteria. Piro seconded the motion. Tabb

expressed his opposition to the motion because he feels that the group has already accomplished this. Scarborough replied that this has not been in writing. Piro stated that he seconded the motion because he felt it clarified some of the things that have been brought up. The motion directs staff to consider those criteria and he wanted to add, have staff identify potential transit villages.

Scarborough replied that that can be incorporated in the transit overlay.

- Pryor threw out a word of caution regarding design standards. They are something that come up in the Zoning Ordinance and are not ingrained within the General Plan. He stated that staff had to show the group some of the difficulties to move to the next step so it did not come back to staff that we had not done what you had asked us to do. We will look at all the environmental issues and factor it in the approach so do not be afraid that your list is not all inclusive of all concerns. This includes whether the utilities are going to be available and all of this will be returned to the group.
- Silver was troubled by the motion because it would seem that we are saying that we have these concepts but now we are going to be flexible. The concepts need to remain as the guiding path of where we are heading, in particular, the concept that this County is not going to accommodate a population growth anymore by extending areas of very low, estate lot development is essential. Concerned that this motion is going to allow us to deviate and expand the estate lot pattern of development, which to him, is the opposite of what we need to be doing. He prefers expanding the village or village core, then go to semi-rural, because we have an excess of semi-rural today.
- Bowlby asked the maker of the motion to consider the following points: community open space; agriculture and whether it is currently being used as ag or whether it is just good for ag; large parcels as corridors; and concurrent reduction in the semi-rural to be converted to a rural designation as we increase the core areas. Whalen replied that they were not included verbally because he feels that staff gets the idea and that they are already covered.
- **Motion:** Tabb moved to take the motion off the floor and to direct staff to proceed. Adams seconded the motion. Whalen withdrew his motion.
- **Motion:** Adams moved to direct staff to use their best professional judgment when revising this map and to bring it back to the committee. Messer seconded the motion.
- Silver requested that if staff deviates from a strict interpretation of the concepts, staff needs to be able to show the group where the deviation occurred and justify it. Pryor stated that this was an appropriate request.
- **Vote:** 14 – 3 – 0 (Coombs, Pryde, and Doyle in opposition).
- Pryde had requested an explanation of why staff felt the motion was needed. Pryor explained that what the words say may not be what you may want to accomplish. He ensured that staff will adhere to good planning principles and will go from a rigid application of what is on paper and good planning principles.
- Holler stated that there were similar concerns east of the CWA that addressed parcelization. Showing another graphic, indicative of east of the CWA, according to the concepts, we would pick up semi-rural areas based on existing parcelization, whereas, staff might recommend to develop a pattern. In the concepts, regional commercial is only addressed in the village core areas, not in core support. Neighborhood commercial is only addressed in core support and not in the core. Obviously there needs to be some flexibility there. Regional commercial is addressed in concept D and he does not see where we would have a regional commercial application, except in Borrego perhaps. No industrial is allowed in the semi-rural and in semi-rural, we have a number of industrial uses, which most are extractive uses. There is no way to create a core around that extractive situation. A lot of them show up in semi-rural and staff recognizes the acknowledgement of that. These concepts really address development parcelization and do not address constraints.

Agenda Item IV: Process –

- Scarborough stated that we can expect to receive a brief planning 101 from the director and then go over the map on January 8th. Goals & Policies will be pushed to a subsequent agenda.
- Adams asked how staff was going to do all the ground-truthing and all that the group will be comfortable with by the 8th. Pryor replied that staff wanted some consensus in that we are going in the right direction.
- Adams asked if the committee will be notified in advance of Goals & Policies. Pryor ensured that the committee will have two-week notice.

- Piro asked to have the concepts shown on the ground.

Agenda Item V: Public Comments –

- Dutch Van Dierendonck stated that it still comes down to two factors – adequate supply of land and resource inventory, which we have not looked at these resources. Just because land is there, does not mean that it is suitable for building. It is his opinion that we need to re-think the developments, like 4-S, and go back to the fact that our backcountry can take on some growth but realize our ambitions.
- Lynne Baker stated to accomplish the goals and policies of good planning, some redevelopment is necessary. She contradicts that multi-family is not affordable and states that there is quite a bit that is affordable and beautiful. Unfortunately, all of them are non-profit but it can be private development.
- Ruth Potter stated that if we do not match low income and employment, we are going to get more commuters. If we are going to put housing in, we need to have a number of jobs, or at least provide the opportunity.